

Appl. No. 10/767,248  
Docket No. 2102397-992820  
Response to Office Action of May 20, 2005

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-24 are pending in the application. Claims 1-24 have been rejected. Claim 1 has been amended. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 has been amended merely to clarify the plurality of operational amplifiers are configured to form an adaptive input range of said system.

Claims 1-2, 5-13 and 24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Sevic et al.* (U.S. Patent 6,137,355). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As understood *Sevic* at best merely discloses an RF amplifier 100 that includes parallel amplifier stages 104a-104n that independently amplify the "RF input signal according to a game characters to determine by the devices construction and the bias voltages applied to it. Column 3 lines 65-67. *Sevic* is directed to an RF amplifier and is not directed to a multi operational amplifier system as recited claims 1-2, 5-13 and 24. Applicant has conducted a word search of *Sevic* for the word "operational" and had no hits. Applicant notes that "a plurality of operational amplifiers" is recited in independent claims 1, 9-11 and 24, and first and second operational amplifier are recited in independent claims 5-7. Lacking at least this claim feature, *Sevic* cannot render claims 1-2, 5-7, 9-13, and 24 unpatentable.

Claim 8 recites a first operational amplifier having an input formed of a NZ NMOS transistor and of an NMOS transistor. As understood *Sevic* does not disclose a NZ NMOS transistor and NMOS transistor forming an input as recited in claim 8. Lacking at least this claim feature, *Sevic* cannot render claim 8 unpatentable.

Therefore it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-2, 5-13, and 24 are patentable over the references of record.

Claims 1-3, 9-12 and 24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by the *Ghanadan et al.* (U.S. Patent 6,639,463). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Page 6 of 9

EMV7191872.1  
351913-992820

Appl. No. 10/767,248  
Docket No. 2102397-992820  
Response to Office Action of May 20, 2005

As understood *Ghanadan* at best merely discloses a multi stage amplifier architecture 40 that includes individual amplifier stages 26a-d coupled and parallel. *Ghanadan* does not disclose or even suggest "a plurality of operational amplifiers" as recited in claims 1-3, 9-12, and 24. Applicant has conducted a word search of *Ghanadan* for the word "operational" and received no hits. Because *Ghanadan* does not disclose even one operational amplifier, *Ghanadan* does not disclose a plurality of operational amplifiers as recited in claims 1-3, 9-12, and 24. Lacking at least this claim feature, *Ghanadan* cannot render claims 1-3, 9-12, and 24 unpatentable. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-3, 9-12, and 24 are patentable over the references of record. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 4, 9-13, and 19-24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Martin et al.* (U.S. Published Patent Application 2003/0006841 A1). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As understood *Martin* at best really discloses a differential multiple input amplifier with a differential output port pair 206a and 206b and a differential input port pair 202a and 202b and second differential input port pair 204a and 204b. This is a single operational amplifier system and not a plurality of operational amplifier system as recited in claims 1, 9, 10, 11, 19, and 24.

Further, *Martin* does not disclose or even suggest the adaptably switchable bias recited in claim 9 and 11. Lacking at least these claim features, *Martin* cannot render claims 1, 4, 9-13, and 19-24 unpatentable. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 4, 9-13 and 19-24 are patentable over the references of record. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 14-18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Pernici et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,212,455). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Page 7 of 9

GM\7191872.1  
351913-992820

Appl. No. 10/767,248  
Docket No. 2102397-992820  
Response to Office Action of May 20, 2005

As understood *Pernici* at best merely discloses a single power CMOS operational amplifier. Accordingly, *Pernici* does not disclose or even suggest the first, second and third operational amplifiers as recited in claim 14 and dependent claims 15-18. Lacking at least this claim feature, *Pernici* cannot render claims 14-18 unpatentable. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 14-18 are patentable over the references of record. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the claims are in an allowable form, and action to that end is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 07-1896 referencing Attorney Docket No. 2102397-992820.

Respectfully submitted,

DLA Piper Rudnick Gray Cary US LLP

Dated: August 19, 2005

By: \_\_\_\_\_



Edward B. Weller

Reg. No. 37,468

Attorneys for Applicant(s)

Edward B. Weller  
DLA Piper Rudnick Gray Cary US LLP  
2000 University Avenue  
East Palo Alto, CA 94303-2248  
650-833-2436 (Direct)  
650-833-2000 (Main)  
650-833-2001 (Facsimile)  
Edward.Weller@dlapiper.com

Page 8 of 8

EMV7191872.1  
351913-992820